REMARKS

Claims 6, 9-12, and 15-17 are pending. Claims 6 and 12 have been amended and claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, and 14 have been canceled. Entry of this paper it is respectfully requested as the claim amendments raise no new issues requiring further searching or consideration by the Examiner, i.e., the amendments indicating that the first and second terminals are "wireless communication" terminals were previously considered in connection with claims 7, 8, 13, and 14. The claim amendments also raise no issues of new matter, place the application in better form for appeal, and do not add any additional claims to the application.

Reconsideration of application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for being anticipated by the Muller patent. These claims have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 6-9 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for being anticipated by the Dormer patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 6 recites a communication system which includes a "first wireless communication terminal" and a "second wireless communication terminal." These terminals are shown, for example, in Figure 2 as cordless telephones 4 and 5. Also included is a base station having a detector, a switch, and a processor. The switch connects a power supply of the first terminal to the base station in response to a power failure signal output from the detector. The processor manages communications between the second terminal and the base station while the base station receives power from the power supply of the first terminal.

The Dormer patent does not teach or suggest the system of claim 6. As shown in Figures 3 and 4, the Dormer system includes a base unit 11 and a cordless handset 12. The handset is powered by a first rechargeable battery 20. The base unit is adapted to receive a second rechargeable battery 40 for charging during operation handset. When the first rechargeable battery 20 becomes discharged, operation of the telephone can be maintained by connecting the second rechargeable battery 40 to the handset.

Claim 1 is different from the Dormer patent in at least two ways.

First, claim 1 recites first and second wireless communication terminals. The Dormer patent does not disclose these features. As discussed above and as shown in Figure 3, the Dormer system includes only one handset. Dormer does not disclose performing any operation using a second handset. Instead, the Dormer base unit provides terminal 43a and 43b which connect to a second rechargeable battery, which clearly does not correspond to a second wireless communication terminal as recited in claims 6.

Second, claim 6 recites a processor which "manages communications between the second terminal and the base unit while the base station receives power from the power supply of the first terminal." In accordance with these recitations, the processor therefore can, for example, maintain a phone call with a second wireless terminal while the first wireless terminal is connected within the cradle of the base station. Since the Dormer patent does not disclose a second wireless communication terminal, it logically follows that the Dormer patent also does

not disclose a processor which manages communications with a second wireless communication terminal while a first terminal is connected to a base station.

Because the Dormer patent does not disclose all the features of claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that Dormer cannot anticipate this claim. It is further submitted that the differences outlined above are sufficient to render claim 6 and its dependent claims non-obvious and thus patentable over the Dormer patent.

Claim 12 recites the steps of connecting a power supply of a first wireless communication terminal to the base station in response to a power-failure detecting step, and a managing communications between a second wireless communication terminal and the base station while the base station receives power from the power supply of the first wireless terminal. As discussed above, the Dormer patent does not disclose these features. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 and its dependent claims are patentably distinguishable from the Dormer patent.

Claims 10, 11, 16, and 17 where rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over the Dormer patent and what is alleged to be "well-known" prior art. By making this rejection, the Examiner has attempted to take Official Notice of an indicator which is activated when a detector detects a power failure. Even if such a detector where well-known at the time the claimed invention was made, Applicants respectfully submit that the features of claims 6 and 12 missing from the Dormer patent were not well-known at that time. Applicants therefore submit

that claims 10, 11, 16, and 17 are non-obvious and thus patentable over the Dormer patent at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 6 and 12.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections in the Final Office Action is hereby respectfully requested. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Samuel W. Ntiros**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 502-9440 DYK/SWN/sbh
November 7, 2003